

CONTENTIONS AROUND THE ZIYADA¹ ('UNDER THE NAVEL') TO WA'IL IBN HUJR'S NARRATION ON THE PLACING OF THE HANDS IN SALAH AS FOUND IN SOME MANUSCRIPTS OF THE MUSANNAF OF IBN ABI SHAYBA (D. 235 AH)

Assalamu alaikum

The following response has not been compiled to initiate a rebuttal as such to the answer of Shaykh Gibril Haddad below, but rather to inform the keen reader of how some contentions may be propounded as an alternative thesis to the solutions proposed below. The un-named questioner has his remarks with the symbol > followed by Shaykh Haddad's answer.

- > I pray you are well. I wanted to ask an important question regarding
> Ziyada(t) to Nuskha(t) of hadith manuscripts. In the attached file you
> may see an analysis to the acceptability or rejection of a narration
> attributed to the Musannaf of Ibn Abi Shayba.
- >
- > It is in connection to the narration of Wa'il (ra) which mentions that
> al-Nabi (sallallahu alaihi wa sallam) allegedly placed his hands
> beneath the navel in Salah. The Ziyada - "Under the navel" is not found
> in many of the available editions today and the first one who seemed to
> have mentioned it was al-Hafiz Ibn Qutlubugha (the student of al-Hafiz
> ibn Hajar - who doesn't seem to have known it also).
- >
- > These days, i saw that Shaykh Wahbi Ghawiji mentioned it in his editing
> of Multaqa al-Abhur, as did Shaykh Zafar al-Uthmani in his I'la
> al-Sunan and others. This ziyada was flatly rejected by Shaykh Muhammad
> Hayat al-Sindi in the past and the latters claim is promoted by
> al-Mubarakpuri in his Tuhtfaul Ahwazi...

(Answer by Shaykh Haddad):

Shaykh Wahbi Ghawji wrote a book on the placement of the hands in Salat entitled *Mawdi` al-Yadayn fil-Salat*, which he summarizes in his book

¹ Ziyada means an additional wording to a text

Arkan al-Islam (1:253-258) in the chapter on the Sunan of Salat. In the latter he states that the hadith of Ibn Abi Shayba with the ziyada is sahih without going into the controversy over it. However, Dr. Nur al-Din has tahqiq in hadith, and does not even mention that narration but only the athar of 'Ali (coming up below) among others in his commentary on Ibn Hajar's Bulugh al-Maram entitled I'lam al-Anam (1:498), in his mention of the Hanafi position in the Sunan of Salat.

- > My question is thus:
- >
- > In the footnote starred (*) - Does al-Nimawi finally endorse the ziyada that is found in some makhtutat or not? Please translate the passage from al-Nimawi and explain this by checking what is he implying in support of his final claim from Ibn Hajar's Sharh on Nukhbatul fikr.
- > Does it mean that if some manuscript(s) may not mention the extra ziyada to a narration, but another manuscript(s) does - one can accept the latter set of manuscript(s) or not? Please give quotes to support your thesis from the Huffaz of the past.

The overwhelming proof is from the early narrators of the Hanafi and Hanbali Schools, who both hold hands below the navel but do not mention the ziyada of Ibn Abi Shayba to that effect. Abu Dawud mentions in his Sunan the riwayas of our liegelord 'Ali, Abu Mijlaz, and Abu Hurayra; Imam Muhammad's Aathaar mention that of Ibrahim al-Nakha'i; Imam Ahmad mentions the same marfu` chain as Ibn Abi Shayba without the ziyada. It is unthinkable they would all leave out a marfu` riwaya proving their position if they had knowledge of it; and if they did not have knowledge of it, it is because it probably didn't exist.

Moreover, Ibn Khuzayma in his Sahih reviews four different chains leading up to Wa'il, three of them without ziyada and the fourth with the ziyada: "on his chest." This shows that he had no knowledge of the ziyada "under the navel." Nor did al-Nasa'i, Muslim, and Ahmad who all exhaustively gathered up the various paths to Wa'il for this narration.

Shaykh Muhammad Hayat al-Sindi in Fath al-Ghafur fi Wad' al-Aydi 'ala al-Sudur mentions the fact that the ziyada "under the navel" is not known before the time of Ibn Qutlubagha. Even after that time, the Hanafi authorities show no awareness of it when discussing the issue. Al-Sindi in Fath al-Ghafur mentions that Ibn Amir al-Hajj (d. 879) said in Sharh Munyat al-Musalli: "It is firmly established from the Sunna is the placing of the right hand on top of the left. There is no firmly established hadith requiring the exact spot of the body where such placing is to be except the said hadith of Wa'il," meaning the ziyada "on his chest." Similarly Ibn Nujaym (d. 970) in al-Bahr al-Ra'iq (1:303).

Mubarakpuri in Tuhtfat al-Ahwazi and Azim Abadi in 'Awn al-Ma'bud

provide decisive arguments in support of the position also held by al-Nimawi and Hayat al-Sindi. Saharanfuri on Abu Dawud quoting al-Nimawi endorses him. Among the strongest proofs is the fact that the major Hanafi Fuqaha Huffaz had no knowledge of the navel ziyada such as Ibn al-Humam (d. 681) in Sharh Fath al-Qadir, Ibn al-Turkmani (d. 750) in al-Jawhar al-Naqi, and al-Zayla'i (d. 762) in Nasb al-Raya, and otherwise there is no way they would have all omitted mentioning it in their illustration of the Hanafi proofs.

Also among the proofs which none of the above mentions:

- Shaykh Mahmud al-Khattab al-Subki (d. 1352) in al-Manhal al-'Adhib al-Mawrud (5:163) mentions that Ibn al-Mundhir [in al-Awsat 3:90-94] mentioned that holding hands below the navel was the position of Abu Hurayra, al-Nakha'i, and Abu Mijlaz, showing no awareness of Ibn Abi Shayba's marfu' ziyada. Al-Subki himself doesn't bring it up.
- Imam al-Badr al-'Ayni in his Sharh Sunan Abi Dawud (Riyadh ed. 3:354-357) when discussing the athar of our liegelord 'Ali radya Allahu 'anh: "The Sunna is to place the hand on top of the hand below the navel" goes meticulously into the chain and the various nusakh of Abu Dawud then the Hanafi madhab but does not mention Ibn Abi Shayba, although he mentions Ibn Hazm's supporting maqwuf narration from Anas "Min akhlaq al-nubuwwa wad` al-yamin `ala al-shimal tahta al-surra," which is infinitely less probative than the marfu' narration with Ibn Abi Shayba's chain, since Ibn Hazm does not even provide a chain for it [Muhalla 4:158].
- Ibn al-Qayyim's omission of the same in his endorsement of the position below the navel in Bada'i' al-Fawa'id (Makka 1996 ed. 3:600=Beirut 1994 ed. 2:95) and I'lam al-Muwaqqi'in (Beirut 1973 ed. 2:401=Dammam Mashhur 2002 ed. 4:287) although he not only ventures to declare the athar of our liegelord 'Ali as sahih - which is more than al-'Ayni himself was prepared to say in 'Umdat al-Qari (5:279) - but he also highlights the ziyada "on his chest" in the hadith of Wa'il!

The latter-day Hanafis hold that the addition "on his chest" is itself a textual corruption, as al-Nimawi suggested in his Ta'liq al-Hasan 'ala Aathaar al-Sunan (1:67) as cited in I'lal al-Sunan (2:196): "In my heart I think it is a textual corruption (tas-hif)." It should be even more definite that the addition "under his navel" is a textual corruption corruption by the same token; and this is precisely what al-Nimawi goes on to say a few pages later (1:70), also as cited in the I'lal (2:199).

Indeed, the Riyadh edition of the Musannaf (2:334) which is one of the two best editions of the Musannaf, the other being that of Shaykh Muhammad 'Awwama (I have not seen it), mentions the hadith of Wa'il without the ziyada but has this footnote: "In manuscript M: 'shimalihi

'fil-salati tahta al-surra,' and the copyist's gaze probably jumped to the next athar [which has those very words], so he copied from it the words 'tahta al-surra.'" This is a very pertinent observation and is the gist of what al-Nimawi said before them.

As for Shaykh Zafar al-Tahanawi's objection to al-Nimawi that "If that addition were found in only one copy, we would agree to his point; however, when it is found in many, then the probability that all the copyist's gazes went astray is not granted" (*I'lal-Sunan* 2:199): this argument does not properly address the stemma. First, the same can be said of the manuscripts of Ibn Abi Shayba which do NOT have the ziyada: it is improbable the copyists all missed it. Second, it is quite possible that the ziyada copies all go back to a single faulty manuscript lesson.

This conclusion solves the enigma of an addition suddenly popping up from the time of Ibn Qutlubagha, and Allah Most High knows best.

As for the starred footnote, al-Nimawi's words mean:

"His words: 'however, it is weak from the aspect of text': I say: This is according to what we have ascertained just now. However, according to the position of hafiz Ibn Hajar in Sharh al-Nukhba, this addition is accepted [as textually authentic], and preponderance needs to be established between itself and whatever contradicts it; because this narration has a shorter chain than the narration 'on his chest' and the like, narrated by Ibn Khuzayma and al-Bazzar."

This is a parting shot to the effect that it would be more correct for the Hanafis to accept the ziyada "under the navel" than for the Shafi`is to accept the ziyada "on his chest", and he very laconically invokes Ibn Hajar's Sharh al-Nukhba concerning the "ziyada fil-matn", and Allah knows best.

Al-Tatawi wrote a short treatise entitled *Dirham al-Surra fi Wad` al-Yadayn Taht al-Surra*, but I didn't see it.

Was-Salam,
GF Haddad

An alternative way at looking at matters connected to the above and beyond the scope of the above answer:

Shaykh Haddad mentioned:

Shaykh Wahbi Ghawji wrote a book on the placement of the hands in Salat entitled *Mawdi` al-Yadayn fil-Salat*, which he summarizes in his book *Arkan*

al-Islam (1:253-258) in the chapter on the Sunan of Salat. In the latter he states that the hadith of Ibn Abi Shayba with the ziyada is sahih without going into the controversy over it. However, Dr. Nur al-Din has tahqiq in hadith, and does not even mention that narration but only the athar of `Ali (coming up below) among others in his commentary on Ibn Hajar's Bulugh al-Maram entitled I`lam al-Anam (1:498), in his mention of the Hanafi position in the Sunan of Salat.

The questioner seems to be mistaken when he claimed that the narration from Wa'il ibn Hujr (ra) with the ziyada (additional wording) was mentioned by our Shaykh, Wahbi Ghawji (hafidhahullah) in his notes to Multaqa al-Abhur of Imam Ibrahim al-Halabi (d. 956 AH). Rather, on pp. 73-74 he mentioned the Athar's of Ali (ra) and Ibrahim al-Nakha'i as part of some of the proofs used by the Hanafi's, as well as some brief explanations on why certain narrations mentioning the placing of the hands upon the chest are problematic. May be the questioner meant the above named Arkan al-Islam by Shaykh Ghawji.

One could surmise that Dr Nurud-Din Itr may not have read into the debate regarding the ziyada to Wa'il's narration in the Musannaf, or come across it to mention its controversy in his I`lam al-Anam. Indeed, some of the later Ahnaf do not merely rely on the athar of Ali (ra), but also the sayings of the Tabi'in like Abu Mijlaz and Ibrahim al-Nakha'i (their narrations being found in the same Musannaf of Ibn Abi Shayba). The narration with the Ziyada was a hotly debated issue more than 250 years ago amongst mainly the Indian subcontinent Ahnaf like: Shaykh Muhammad Hayat al-Sindi² (d. 1163 AH) and Shaykh Muhammad Hashim al-Sindi al-Tatawi³ (d. 1174 AH)

Shaykh Hayat al-Sindi seems to have been the first writer to oppose the ziyada, while Shaykh Hashim accepted it, as did Shaykh Muhammad Qa'im al-Sindi in his radd to his own Shaykh - Muhammad Hayat al-Sindi, in an unpublished treatise known as Fawz al-Kiram. All of these named works are in manuscript format in Dar al-Musannifin, A'zamgarh, India. Shaykh Hayat's risala has been published with the editing of Muhammad Diyaur Rahman al-A'zami,⁴ while the follow up rebuttals by Shaykh Hashim were printed in Pakistan by Shaykh Na'eem Ashraf Nur Ahmed with a foreword by the late Shaykh Abdal Fattah Abu Ghudda (d. 1997 CE). The latter seems to have had no problems with the Ziyada and more so his principal student in the Hijaz and fellow Syrian: Shaykh Muhammad Awwama (based in Madina) affirmed it (see later for proof).

² Author of *Fath al-Ghafur fi Wad' al-Aydi `ala al-Sudur*

³ Author of *Dirham al-Surra fi Wad' al-Yadayn Taht al-Surra* and 2 further follow up reply's to Shaykh Hayat al-Sindi on where the hands should be placed according to the dominant Hanafi position

⁴ a former Hindu who converted to Islam, took on Salafism as his path; and may be still lecturing in Madina University

Though Dr Itr may not have mentioned it, does it automatically mean that he was against the Ziyada? May be Dr Haddad can ask him what he thinks of the findings of Shaykh Awwama. Did the contemporary Syrian Shaykh, Asad Saghirji not mention the narration with the Ziyada in his work on Hanafi fiqh evidences?

What can be deciphered is that even today there are Hanafi Ulama living in the Arab and Indian subcontinent lands who have affirmed the Ziyada.

Shaykh Haddad said:

The overwhelming proof is from the early narrators of the Hanafi and Hanbali Schools, who both hold hands below the navel but do not mention the ziyada of Ibn Abi Shayba to that effect. Abu Dawud mentions in his Sunan the riwayas of our liegelord `Ali, Abu Mijlaz, and Abu Hurayra; Imam Muhammad's Aathaar mention that of Ibrahim al-Nakha`i; Imam Ahmad mentions the same marfu` chain as Ibn Abi Shayba without the ziyada. It is unthinkable they would all leave out a marfu` riwaya proving their position if they had knowledge of it; and if they did not have knowledge of it, it is because it probably didn't exist.

The fact that someone didn't mention a narration in their respective Hadith collection(s) is not a decisive proof that a narration did not exist in their time, or before them. Shaykh Haddad mentioned the Sunan of Abu Dawud and that it contains the narrations of Ali (ra), Abu Mijlaz (mu'allaq form) and that of Abu Hurayra (ra), but did not mention that in some recensions there is a narration for placing the hands above the navel attributed to Ali (ra), a mu'allaq narration from Sa'eed ibn Jubayr as well a Mursal narration for placing on the chest from Tawus al-Yamani. This latter narration is not found in other recensions of Abu Dawud's Sunan.

One may raise the following questions:

Would that mean that the latter narration from Tawus is a later interpolation and that it was not extant in the days of Abu Dawud? Has anyone disputed its very existence after Abu Dawud? Why is it not mentioned by most Huffaz or Fuqaha from the Shafi'i Madhhab when detailing their position and evidences?

The answer could be due to the point that they never came across it in a nuskha of Sunan Abu Dawud or let alone read it elsewhere, though Ibn Abdal Barr mentioned it in al-Tamheed (20/75) as did al-Bayhaqi in his Ma'rifatus Sunan (2/340). Also, it is known that Abu Dawud had different transmitters narrating his Sunan at different time frames, just like the Muwatta of Imam Malik. Could that not be the case with the Musannaf of Ibn Abi Shayba also?

Indeed, another edition of the Musannaf is due out from the editing of the Riyadh based Salafist writer: Dr Sa'd ibn Nasir al-Shathari. I recall some 3 years ago one individual by the name of Abdullah Mazru'a from Riyadh claiming that al-Shathari had "discovered" some 5000 extra narrations not found in the Indian edition of the Musannaf printed in the 1960's! One of my colleagues met Shaykh Awwama last year and mentioned this point and the Shaykh dismissed it as an outlandish assertion on their part!

The same principle may be applied with the narration of Hulb at-Ta'i which is found in the printed editions of the Musnad of Imam Ahmed Ibn Hanbal mentioning the placing on the chest, but the same narration is in the Jami of al-Tirmidhi and elsewhere from Hulb without specifying exactly where the hands should be placed.

The first scholar to mention this narration from Hulb as in the Musnad seems to be the 6th century Hanbali, Ibn al-Jawzi (d. 597 AH) in his al-Tahqiq (with a wording slightly different to what is in the printed editions of the Musnad of Ahmed ibn Hanbal), though his younger contemporary, Ibn Qudama al-Maqdisi (d. 620 AH) seems not to have come across it to mention in his al-Mughni and elsewhere. The Hanbali, Diya al-Maqdisi (d. 643 AH) mentioned the Hulb narration in his al-Sunan wal Ahkam (2/35) but didn't consider it sound enough to incorporate in his al-Mukhtara. Rather, Diya al-Maqdisi incorporated the athar of Imam Ali (ra) mentioning under the navel into the Mukhtara; thus considering it to be authentic despite mentioning those who weakened the sub narrator in the sanad back to Ali (ra) known as Abdar Rahman ibn Ishaq al-Kufi in his al-Sunan wal Ahkam (2/36, no. 1286)

Has anyone ever denied the existence of Hulb's narration which seems to be found in some manuscripts of the Musnad with the Ziyada on the chest? Even though later Hanabila like Majd Ibn Taymiyya, his grandson Taqiud-Din and his pupil Ibn al-Qayyim al-Jawziyya have no mention of it in their works, though their contemporaries like al-Dhahabi in his Tanqih al-Tahqiq and Ibn Kathir in his Jami al-Masanid knew of it.

Could one not propound the thesis that this specific narration attributed to Hulb (ra) with the ziyada for placing on the chest is not found in all manuscripts of the Musnad? What may indicate this is the fact that on looking into the Masa'il works going back to Imam Ahmed ibn Hanbal from his own sons: Abdullah and Salih, as well as that from Ibn Hani, al-Kawsaj and finally Abu Dawud al-Sijistani, there is no mention of this narration when answering where the hands should be placed. In fact, one may read Imam Ibn Hanbal disapproving of the placing of the hands upon the chest according to the Masa'il al-Imam Ahmed transmitted by Abu Dawud. The reader may also look at the biography of Ibn Hanbal in the initial pages to the Tabaqat al-Hanabila of Ibn Abi Ya'la for mention of this disapproval.

The point here is that someone not mentioning a specific narration is not a proof by itself of the non-existence of a narration, or that it was invented or interpolated later on in well known books of Hadith.

Shaykh Haddad mentioned:

Imam Ahmad mentions the same marfu` chain as Ibn Abi Shayba without the ziyada.

Those who affirmed the ziyada have argued that though the same marfu chain is found in the Musnad and similarly in other Hadith collections without the ziyada: “Under the navel”, its very presence with the additional wording in some copies of the Musannaf is a ziyada by a Thiqa (trustworthy) narrator. Additions made by trustworthy narrators to a text were acceptable to many Hadith scholars with some conditions. This latter point was mentioned by Shaykh Hashim al-Sindi in his radd to Shaykh Hayat al-Sindi.

To mention another example of a narration not mentioned by most Hanafi/Hanbali Ulama:

Looking at most of the printed editions of the Tamheed of Ibn Abdal Barr al-Maliki, one may see a narration from al-Athram --- Abul Walid al-Tayalisi --- Hammad ibn Salama --- Asim al-Jahdari --- Uqba ibn Suhban – who heard Imam Ali (ra) mention under the tafsir of Fasalli li-rabbika wanhar – that the hands should be placed beneath the navel.⁵ The narration in Arabic:

ذكر الأثرم قال حدثنا أبو الوليد الطيالسي قال حدثنا حماد بن سلمة عن عاصم الجحدري عن عقبة بن صفهان سمع عليا يقول في قول الله عز وجل < فصل لربك وآخر > قال وضع اليمنى على اليسرى تحت السرة

House of Verification

This sanad is at least Jayyid⁶ and it is a very good support to the weaker Athar of Imam Ali (ra) as in Sunan Abu Dawud and elsewhere via the route of Abdar Rahman ibn Ishaq al-Kufi. This narration does not seem to have been mentioned

⁵ In one manuscript of al-Tamheed it has the ending as “al-Thunduwa” (male breast) rather than “al-Surra” (the navel) which is most likely to be as Tas-hif of a scribe, since there is a very similar narration in al-Bayhaqi’s al-Khilafiyat that I have in manuscript format mentioning “on the navel” as reported with al-Bayhaqi’s sanad back to Uqba ibn Suhban from Imam Ali (ra)

⁶ As indicated by the late Shaykh Hamid Ibrahim Ahmed of Egypt and Muhammad Hussain al-Uqbi in their editing to al-Muhadhdhab fi Ikhtisar al-Sunan al-Kabir by al-Dhahabi, 2/13, fn, 2)

by a single Hanafi or those from other Madhhabs in their *tahqiq* to where the hands should be placed. Are we to suggest that this is also a narration interpolated into some manuscripts of al-Tamheed, or is it not fairer to suggest that many of the Huffaz didn't come across it to mention it in their works?!

Similarly, I have a manuscript⁷ of al-Khilafiyyat of al-Bayhaqi mentioning a similar narration back to Uqba ibn Suhban from Imam Ali (ra) but mentioning "on the navel", though its *sanad* is weak. On the same page of al-Khilafiyyat there is a narration from Anas (ra) mentioning placing under the navel, though once again the chain is weak due to the presence of Sa'eed ibn Zarbi. Both of these narrations can also be seen in the Mukhtasar edition of al-Khilafiyyat by Ahmed ibn Farah al-Lakhmi al-Ishbili al-Shaf'i (d. 699 AH) which is in print. These two latter narrations were missed by most of the Hanafi Ulama after al-Bayhaqi and I have never seen any Hanafi or Hanbali mention them to date from al-Khilafiyyat.

Dr Haddad mentioned the point:

Among the strongest proofs is the fact that the major Hanafi Fuqaha Huffaz had no knowledge of the navel ziyada such as Ibn al-Humam (d. 681)⁸ in Sharh Fath al-Qadir, Ibn al-Turkmani (d. 750) in al-Jawhar al-Naqi, and al-Zayla'i (d. 762) in Nasb al-Raya, and otherwise there is no way they would have all omitted mentioning it in their illustration of the Hanafi proofs.

One possible answer to the above point would be that they may not have come across the manuscript(s) of the Musannaf with the Ziyada, just as they most likely didn't come across the narration from Ali (ra) as in some copies of al-Tamheed of Ibn Abdal Barr and the narration from Anas (ra) in al-Khilafiyyat.

Take for example, Yusuf al-Zayla'i. He mentioned the narration from Wa'il regarding placing the hands on the chest in his Nasb al-Ra'ya as found in Sahih Ibn Khuzayma – but he didn't mention the narration of Hulb as in the Musnad of Ibn Hanbal, or the variant from Wa'il (ra) with the wording "Inda al-Sadr" as in the Musnad al-Bazzar, though Ibn Hajar after him did mention al-Bazzar's narration in his Fath al-Bari as did his Shaykh: Nurud-Din al-Haythami in the Majma al-Zawa'id.

Surprisingly though, one wonders why al-Haythami did not seem to know of or come across the Hulb narration with the wording on the chest as in the Musnad of Ibn Hanbal while compiling his Majma al-Zawa'id, or al-Suyuti after him in his Jam al-Jawami or al-Muttaqi al-Hindi in his Kanz al-Ummal. Note also, that Ibn Hajar

⁷ The Haci Selim Aga copy found in Istanbul

⁸ He died in 861 AH and not as typed up incorrectly

did not mention the Hulb narration in his Atraf to the Musnad of Ibn Hanbal as Shaykh Hashim al-Sindi mentioned, and I have seen that this is the case in the printed edition of the Atraf.

In the printed editions of Ibn Hajar's Fath al-Bari (2/224)⁹ it appears as though Ibn Hajar knew of Hulb's narration attributed to the Musnad of Imam Ahmed, but the same passage mentioning this was presented by Muhammad al-Zarqani (d. 1122 AH) in his Sharh on Muwatta Malik (1/186) from Fath al-Bari without mentioning Hulb's narration! One wonders why that as late as al-Shawkani¹⁰ (in his Nayl al-Awtar, 3/25) he didn't know of Hulb's narration despite utilising Fath al-Bari in his Nayl al-Awtar quite often.

[Another two narrations:](#)

Imam Qasim ibn Qutlubugha mentioned another narration from Wa'il for placing the hands on the batn (abdomen/belly) in his short follow up known as Munyatul Alma'i¹¹ to Nasb al-Ra'ya of al-Zayla'i. He attributed this particular narration to an unspecified work by Abul Qasim al-Tabarani (360 AH).

Indeed, it is found in the Mu'jam al-Kabir of al-Tabarani and Ma'rifatus Sahaba of Abu Nu'aym, though one would have expected al-Haythami to have mentioned it in his Majma al-Zawa'id from al-Tabarani, it seems to have been missed by him for some unknown reason. It also appears to have weakness in the sanad due to the presence of Hajjaj ibn Nusayr, though the words of al-Hafiz Abu Ahmed ibn Adi (d. 365 AH) should also be considered below before passing a conclusive ruling on its overall status. Al-Tabarani narrated it as follows in his Mu'jam al-Kabir:

حدثنا أبو مسلم الكشي ثنا حجاج بن نصیر ثنا شعبة عن سلمة بن كهيل قال سمعت حجر أبا العنبر يحدث عن وائل الحضرمي أنه صلی الله علیه وسلم حين قال ولا الصالين قال آمين وأخفى بها صوته ثم وضع يده اليمني على بطنه وجعلها على بطنه وكان إذا قال سمع الله لمن حمده قال اللهم ربنا لك الحمد ويسلم عن عبئه وعن يساره تسليمتين

In the Ma'rifatus-Shababa (no. 5882) of Abu Nu'aym it was mentioned as follows:

- حدثنا فاروق ، حدثنا أبو مسلم الكشي ، ثنا حجاج بن نصیر ، ثنا شعبة ، عن سلمة بن كهيل ، قال : سمعت حجرا أبا العنبر الحضرمي ، يحدث ، عن وائل الحضرمي : " أنه صلی الله علیه وسلم حين قال : ولا

⁹ Dar al-Ma'rifa edition with the scant notes of Bin Baz (d. 1999)

¹⁰ He died in 1250 AH/1834 CE

¹¹ Printed by Shaykh Zahid al-Kawthari in 1369 AH

الضالين قال : "آمين " ويخفي بها صوته ، ثم وضع يده اليمنى على يده اليسرى ، وجعلها على بطنه وكان إذا قال : " سمع الله مل حمده " قال : " اللهم ربنا ولك الحمد " ، وسلم عن يمينه ، وعن يساره تسليمتين ¹²
رواه الشوري¹² والعلاء بن صالح ، ومحمد بن سلمة بن كهيل ، عن سلمة نحوه

Though Hajjaj is weakened by a number of Hadith masters, looking at Ibn Adi's al-Kamil fi Du'afa al-rijal (2/233) one may note that under the entry for Hajjaj ibn Nusayr he mentioned a few narrations, but not the above mentioning the placing on the batn, via the route of Ibn Nusayr and concluded by saying:

قال بن عدي وهذا الحديث لا اعلم رواه عن زيد بن اسلم بهذا الإسناد غير المنذر بن زياد هذا ولحجاج بن نصیر أحاديث وروایات عن شیوخه ولا اعلم له شيئاً منکراً غير ما ذکرت و هو في غير ما ذکرته صالح

Al-Hafiz Ibn Qutlubugha was also praised by his own Shaykh Ibn Hajar al-Asqalani. The former has also demonstrated his high knowledge of Hadith by even showing narrations that his own Shaykh Ibn Hajar could not find in his short follow up to al-Diraya by Ibn Hajar.

Another athar from Imam Ali (ra) was collected by the later Hanafi Shaykh, Ali al-Muttaqi al-Hindi (d. 975 AH) in his Kanz al-Ummal. This latter narration was collected by the Hanbali, Abu Muhammad al-Ibrahimi (d. 476 AH) and before him by the well known Imam, Ibn Shahin (d. 385 AH) of Baghdad. The narration being:

كتر العمال – للمتقى الهندي

44271 - عن علي قال: ثلاثة من أخلاق الأنبياء: تعجيل الإفطار، وتأخير السحور، ووضع الأكف تحت

السرة في الصلاة

(ابن شاهين وأبو محمد الإبراهيمي في كتاب الصلاة).

The above narration was not mentioned by major Hanafi Ulama like al-Zayla'i, Ibn al-Turkumani, al-Ayni, Ibn al-Humam, Ibn Qutlubugha, Ibn Amir al-Haaj; but can one deny that it was not extant in the works of Ibn Shahin and al-Ibrahimi

¹² Imam Sufyan al-Thawri held the view that the hands should be placed beneath the navel as a number of Ulama have mentioned, as did Imam Ishaq ibn Rahawayh who regarded it as the strongest position as reported from him by Ishaq ibn Mansur al-Kawsaj (see Masa'il al-Imam Ahmed wa Ishaq ibn Rahawayh)

respectively well before these Hanafi Imams?! It seems that Ali al-Muttaqi was the first Hanafi to mention the above narration in the 10th century after Hijra from Ibn Shahin and al-Ibrahimi, though others from that time like Mulla Ali al-Qari al-Hanafi (d. 1014 AH) did not seem to have known it. There is also a similar variant athar from Imam Ali (ra) mentioning placing of the hands under the navel in the Musnad ascribed to Imam Zayd ibn Ali (ra), though the sanad going back to Imam Zayd is highly questionable in its authenticity.

The point being again that none of the major Ahnaf or later Huffaz mentioned the Batn narration from Wa'il besides Ibn Qutlubugha, though for sure it exists in the above named works of al-Tabarani and Abu Nu'aym. The same applies to the narration reported by Ibn Shahin and al-Ibrahimi, and that from Ibn Abdal Barr's al-Tamheed, as well as that from Anas (ra) as in al-Bayhaqi's al-Khilafiyyat. Most Hanafi Huffaz/Fuqaha did not mention these narrations with their asanid though they were known to a small number named above.

As for Shaykh Haddad's point:

Moreoever, Ibn Khuzayma in his Sahih reviews four different chains leading up to Wa'il, three of them without ziyada and the fourth with the ziyada: "on his chest." This shows that he had no knowledge of the ziyada "under the navel." Nor did al-Nasa'i, Muslim, and Ahmad who all exhaustively gathered up the various paths to Wa'il for this narration.

One could say that Ibn Khuzayma and the other Huffaz before him didn't know or come across the ziyada: "under the navel", nor did the Imams: al-Nasa'i, Muslim, and Ahmad - seem to know of the Batn narration from Wa'il (ra) or the variant from al-Bazzar saying "near the chest" also ascribed to Wa'il (ra), or the narration from Anas (ra) as found in al-Bayhaqi's al-Khilafiyyat and its variant from Anas (ra) that Ibn Hazm mentioned in his al-Muhalla in mu'allaq format. The latter must have accepted the variant narration from Anas (ra) as per what he mentioned in the muqaddima to al-Muhalla. Hence, Badrud-Din al-Ayni and Ibn al-Turkumani mentioned it from Ibn Hazm as they considered Ibn Hazm's criterion in accepting it.

House of Verification

Shaykh Haddad continued to state:

Shaykh Muhammad Hayat al-Sindi in Fath al-Ghafur fi Wad` al-Aydi `ala al-Sudur mentions the fact that the ziyada "under the navel" is not known before the time of Ibn Qutlubagha. Even after that time, the Hanafi authorities show no awareness of it when discussing the issue.

It has already been mentioned that Shaykh Hayat's claims were refuted by his own student (Muhammad Qa'im al-Sindi) and their contemporary: Muhammad Hashim

al-Sindi. The claim that it was unknown before the time of Ibn Qutlubugha needs to be proven. It has already been mentioned above the name of Shaykh Muhammad Awwama of Syria who resides in Madina al-Munawwara, and his recently printed 26 volume edition of the Musannaf of Ibn Abi Shayba.

Shaykh Haddad mentioned:

Al-Sindi in Fath al-Ghafur mentions that Ibn Amir al-Hajj (d. 879) said in Sharh Munyat al-Musalli: "It is firmly established from the Sunna is the placing of the right hand on top of the left. There is no firmly established hadith requiring the exact spot of the body where such placing is to be except the said hadith of Wa'il," meaning the ziyada "on his chest." Similarly Ibn Nujaym (d. 970) in al-Bahr al-Ra'iq (1:303).

The narration being referred to above is the one for placing the hands upon the chest as found in the Sahih of Ibn Khuzayma (1/243, no. 479). This narration is not free of weakness in its sanad and more so its matan, due to the presence of Mu'ammal ibn Isma'il who was saduq but one who would make mistakes, and at times was alone in what he related with no one supporting his report for placing on the chest. Meaning, that this narration has come via many routes and without the wording connected to placing on the chest being transmitted except via routes which contain Mu'ammal. Additionally, Mu'ammal narrated this Hadith from Sufyan al-Thawri, whose fiqhi position was to place the hands beneath the navel. A number of Shafi'i Ulama mentioned this narration in their works but as Shaykh Hashim al-Sindi noted, not many Ulama had possession of the manuscript of Sahih ibn Khuzayma to evaluate the sanad analytically. Hence, what Shaykh Haddad mentioned from Ibn al-Qayyim (in red) is not far from the truth when he said:

- Ibn al-Qayyim's omission of the same in his endorsement of the position below the navel in Bada'i` al-Fawa'id (Makka 1996 ed. 3:600=Beirut 1994 ed. 2:95) and I'lam al-Muwaqqi`in (Beirut 1973 ed. 2:401=Dammam Mashhur 2002 ed. 4:287) although he not only ventures to declare the athar of our liegelord `Ali as sahih - which is more than al-'Ayni himself was prepared to say in 'Umdat al-Qari (5:279) - but he also highlights the ziyada "on his chest" in the hadith of Wa'il!

Shaykh Haddad mentioned:

Indeed, the Riyadh edition of the Musannaf (2:334) which is one of the two best editions of the Musannaf, the other being that of Shaykh Muhammad `Awwama (I have not seen it), mentions the hadith of Wa'il without the ziyada but has this footnote: "In manuscript M: 'shimalihi fil-salati tahta al-surra,' and the copyist's gaze probably jumped to the next athar [which has those very words], so he copied from it the words 'tahta al-surra.'"

I have both of these editions before me. The edition by Shaykh Muhammad Awwama al-Hanafi was released last year (2006) and was lauded by the Syrian Shaykh – Majd Makki al-Hanafi (based in Jeddah). The Riyadh edition¹³ was edited by two Salafi's (Hamd al-Jum'a and Muhammad Luhaydan) who showed a form of dishonesty here as will be mentioned below. The latter also showed their vehemence for Shaykh al-Kawthari in that edition.

What Shaykh Haddad referred to in the Riyadh edition is as follows:

٣٩٥٥ - حدثنا وكيع عن موسى بن عمير عن علقمة بن (٢) وأبيه قال: رأيت النبي ﷺ وضع يمينه على شماله في الصلاة (٣).
 ٣٩٥٦ - (حدثنا وكيع عن ربيع عن أبي معاشر عن إبراهيم قال: «يضع يمينه على شماله في الصلاة») (٤) تحت السرة.
 ٣٩٥٧ - حدثنا عبد السلام بن شداد الجريري (٥) أبو طالوت عن (٦) غزوان بن جرير الضبي عن أبيه قال: «كان عليٌ إذا قام في الصلاة وضع يمينه على رُسْغه (٧) فلا يزال كذلك حتى يركع متى ما رکع، إلا أن يصلح ثوبه أو يحلّ جسده».

(١) سقطت من (ج) و(م) و(ك).

(٢) في (ج): «علقمة عن وائل ...» وهو خطأ.

(٣) في (م): «شماله في الصلاة تحت السرة» ولعله سبق نظره إلى الأثر الذي بعده فكتب منه: «تحت السرة».

(٤) سقط ما بين القوسين من (ج).

Notice that the two editors did mention (under no. 3955, fn. 3) that the ziyada is found in the manuscript abbreviated with the letter M (Meem) as Shaykh Haddad mentioned. This manuscript was the one in the possession of the Hanafi Hafiz of Hijaz, Shaykh Muhammad Abdi al-Sindi (d. 1257 AH), and it is found in Maktaba al-Mahmudiyya in Madina al-Munawwara.

Both of these manuscripts were also utilized by Shaykh Awwama as will be seen below. Shaykh Muhammad Awwama affirmed the Ziyada in his editing of al-Musannaf and had the narration from Wa'il (ra) printed with the Ziyada, just as Shaykh Habibur Rahman al-A'zami¹⁴ did before him. Scans from the Musannaf with the notes of Shaykh Awwama:

¹³ Printed by Maktaba al-Rushd, 1st edn 2004/1425 AH

¹⁴ This being an error due to being mislead by the late Bakr Abu Zayd of Saudi Arabia. Please see here for more clarification - <https://archive.org/details/THOSEWHOTRULYLIEDAGAINSTSHAYKHALAZAMI>

٣٩٥٩ - حدثنا وكيع، عن موسى بن عمير، عن علقة بن وائل بن

٣٩٥٩ - تقدم من وجه آخر عن وائل قبل حديثين، وهذا إسناد صحيح، والصواب سماع علقة من أبيه، كما تراه في التعليق على ترجمة علقة في «التفريغ» (٤٦٨٤)، و«الكافش» (٣٨٧٦).

ومما يذكر في أدلة المسألة: ما تقدم نقله قبل قليل آخر تخریج (٣٩٥٨) عن ابن حزم من حديث أنس أنه زاد: «تحت السرة».

«تحت السرة»: زيادة ثابتة في ت، ع، كما يرى القارئ الكريم صورتهما في مقدمة هذا المجلد، وتسلسل ت كان انتهاء نسخ هذا المجلد منها سنة ١٧٤١هـ، وعليها خط الإمام العيني في مواضع، كما ذكرته في المقدمة صفحة ٣٠، فلا يبعد أن الإمام القاسم بن قطلوبي قد وقف عليها ونقل منها هذا الحديث في كتابه «التعريف والإخبار بتأريخ أحاديث الاختيار»، وكانت وفاته سنة ٨٧٩، وكلامه في الورقة ٢٧/ب من النسخة التي بخطه، وهي محفوظة في مكتبة فيض الله باصطنبول برقم ٢٩٢، وقال بعدما نقله سندًا ومتنا: «وهذا إسناد جيد»، بل إن سياق كلامه واضح في تقديم هذه الرواية على رواية ابن خزيمة (٤٧٩) التي فيها زيادة «على صدره» وإعلاله لها برواية ابن أبي شيبة.

وهذه الزيادة في نسخة العلامة محمد عبد السندي من «التعريف والإخبار» ٢٣/ب، وهي في طوب قبو سراي، وفي نسخته من «المصنف»، وهي التي أرمز لها بحرف (ع)، ولذلك قال في حاشيته العظيمة «طوال الأنوار على الدر المختار» ١: ٦٢٠/آ من النسخة الأزهرية: «ومما لا يُماري في الاحتجاج به: ما أخرجه ابن أبي شيبة في «المصنف»: حدثنا وكيع، عن موسى بن عمير، عن علقة بن وائل بن حجر، عن أبيه قال: رأيت النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم يضع يمينه على شماله في الصلاة تحت السرة. ورجاله كلهم ثقات أئمّات».

فلا حاجة إلى هذا الصخب والإزراء والاتهام من لا يعرف قدر العلماء، ولا يرضى عن من ليس من أهل مذهب وخصالته! حتى في بعض الصحف اليومية! كما

حُجْر، عن أبيه قال: رأيت النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم وضع يمينه على

تجده في «زوايع في وجه السنة قديماً وحديثاً» ص ٢٥١، وجريدة المدينة المنورة ١٠ / ٥ / ١٤١٠ هـ العدد ٢٨٤٥، وغيرهما.

ومن نقل الحديث عن إحدى النسخ الأربع خ، ظ، ن، ش التي ليس فيها هذه الجملة: معدور في عدم إثبات هذه الزيادة، لكنه ليس معدوراً في نفي ورودها، ومن نقله عن إحدى النسختين اللتين فيهما هذه الزيادة: هو معدور في إثباتها، بل واجب عليه ذلك، ولا يجوز له حذفها، فعلى مَ التباير والتباذل؟!

فإن قيل: يحتمل أن تكون جملة «تحت السرة» هذه ليست من تمام حديث وائل، إنما هي من تمام أثر إبراهيم التخعي التالي: «حدثنا وكيع، عن ربيع، عن أبي محشر، عن إبراهيم قال: يضع يمينه على شماله في الصلاة تحت السرة». ويؤيد قيله هذا بأن أثر التخعي ساقط من نسخة ت، فربما كانت هذه الجملة بقيت من أثر التخعي وانصلت بحديث وائل؟!

والجواب: أن هذا ظنٌ وشكٌ يفرح به أعداء الله والإسلام، لو فتح لما بقي لنا ثقة بشيء من مصادر ديننا! ومع ذلك فماذا نفعل بثبوت ذلك كله في نسخة الشيخ محمد عابد السندي، التي فيها الحديث والأثر، وفي آخر كل منها: تحت السرة؟! ومع من زاد علم وإثبات وحججه، فماذا مع النافي؟!

فهاتان نسختان ثبت فيهما «تحت السرة»، يضاف إليها ثلاتُ آخر: نسخة العلامة قاسم، وقد تكون هي نسخة ت، ونسخة العلامة عبد القادر بن أبي بكر الصديقي مفتى مكة المكرمة، ونسخة العلامة محمد أكرم السندي، نقل ذلك عنها العلامة محمد هاشم التوي السندي في رسالته «ترصيع الدرة على درهم الصرة» ص ٨٤.

وإباء للذمة أقول: إن الطبعة الهندية ذات الخمسة عشر مجلداً لمصنف ابن أبي شيبة لم يكن فيها أول ما طبعت زيادة «تحت السرة»، ولما قامت إدارة القرآن والعلوم الإسلامية في كراتشي سنة ١٤٠٦ هـ بتصويره أراد مؤسساها فضيلة الشيخ نور أحمد رحمة الله سد ثغرة النقص التي فيها، وتنقيح الكتاب من أخطائه المطبعية الكثيرة والكبيرة.

=

House of Verification

شماله في الصلاة تحت السرة.

٣٩٦٠ - حدثنا وكيع، عن ربيع، عن أبي معشر، عن إبراهيم قال: يضع يميته على شماله في الصلاة تحت السرة.

٣٩٦١ - حدثنا عبد السلام بن شداد الجُرَيْري أبو

فسد الشغرة بطباعة القسم الأول من المجلد الرابع.

وأما أخطاؤه: فأخبرني من لسانه إلى أذني، وأنا أمشيه في الحرم النبوى الشريف، أنه قد عهد إلى بعض أهل العلم عنده في كراشي بتصحيحها، ففعلوا، وبلغت الأخطاء معهم نحو ثمانية آلاف غلطة مطبعية! فقدت الدار الثقة بهذه الطبعة تماماً.

وقد أخبر الشيخ في حينها - ثم أطلع - على المساجلة العلمية التي دارت بين الشيخ محمد حياة السندي والشيخ محمد هاشم السندي رحمهما الله، في مسألة موضع وضع الدين في الصلاة، وتح عنها كتابة خمس رسائل بينهما - طبعتها الدار بعد - ومنها رسالة الشيخ هاشم «ترصيح الدرة»، وفيها نقل الشيخ هاشم زيادة «تحت السرة» عن ثلاث نسخ خطية وقف عليها بنفسه، وهي النسخ التي قدمت ذكرها.

فحصلت القناعة التامة عند صاحب الدار الشيخ نور أحمد بصحبة إضافة «تحت السرة» على النص المطبوع بالهند، بناء على فقد الثقة بتلك الطبعة، وبناء على حصول الثقة بما في النسخ الخطية الثلاثة، لا أنه تجرأ على الكذب على رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم، ولا من باب التلاعب بالنصوص نصرة للمذهب، ولا، ولا، مما قيل ويقال. والله سبحانه هو الحبيب، وهو الرقيب العليم بالثبات.

٣٩٦١ - «الجُرَيْري»: بالجيم، وأهملت في النسخ، وصوابه ما أثبته، انظر «الأنساب» للسعاني ٢ : ٥٣ ، والتعليق عليه وعلى «الإكمال» لابن ماكولا ٢ : ٢٠٨ ، ولم يذكر الرجل بهذه النسبة في كتب التراجم، انظر مصادر ترجمته في التعليق على =

House of Verification

The nuskha found in Tunis was that possessed by the later Hanafi Hafiz, Muhammad Murtada al-Zabidi (d. 1205 AH). This copy was scribed between the years 741 AH to 744 AH by a Hanbali known as Yusuf ibn Abdal Latif ibn Abdal Baqi ibn Mahmud al-Harrani. This nuskha has the handwriting of the Hanafi Imam Badrud-Din al-Ayni on its margins in some places. It may also be the copy that was also utilized by al-Ayni's younger contemporary Hanafi, al-Hafiz Qasim ibn Qutlubugha in Egypt.

Hence, when Shaykh Haddad said:

Shaykh Muhammad Hayat al-Sindi in *Fath al-Ghafur fi Wad` al-Aydi `ala al-Sudur* mentions the fact that the ziyada "under the navel" is not known before the time of Ibn Qutlubagha. Even after that time, the Hanafi authorities show no awareness of it when discussing the issue.

This is not entirely accurate, since Imam al-Ayni (b. 762 – d. 855 AH) who was the elder contemporary to Ibn Qutlubugha (b. 802 – d. 879 AH) may have known of it as did the Hanbali scribe before them. There is no evidence to suggest that al-Ayni rejected the Ziyada found in that 8th century nuskha, though he did not mention it in his works.

As for the Hanafi's after al-Ayni and Ibn Qutlubugha, it was mentioned by Shaykh Muhammad Abul Tayyib ibn Abdal Qadir al-Sindi al-Madani (d. 1140 AH) in his Sharh on al-Tirmidhi,¹⁵ seen and accepted by Shaykh Hashim al-Sindi and Shaykh Qa'im al-Sindi in the manuscript of the Musannaf possessed by the Hanafi Mufti of Makka, Shaykh Abdal Qadir ibn Abu Bakr al-Siddiqi (d. 1138 AH according to Shaykh Abdal Fattah Abu Ghudda), and in Sind it was seen by Shaykh Hashim al-Sindi in Shaykh Muhammad Akram al-Nasrpuri's personal copy. It was probably seen by al-Hafiz Murtada al-Zabidi (d. 1205 AH) since he possessed the 8th century copy of the Musannaf. After them it was found in the nuskha of the Musannaf possessed by Shaykh Muhammad Abid al-Sindi (d. 1257 AH) and accepted by him in his *Tawali al-Anwar*. It was mentioned by Shaykh Abdal Hayy al-Lucknawi (d. 1304 AH) in his *Umdatur Ri'aya* (p. 165) followed by his pupil, Shaykh al-Nimawi (d. 1322 AH) in his *Athar al-Sunan*.

After the time of al-Nimawi, it was mentioned by the Indian Barelwi Mufti Ahmed Yar Khan in his *Ja'a al-Haqq* where he declared the sanad Sahih and its narrators all trustworthy. It was mentioned with the Ziyada by the late Deobandi Shaykh – Habibur Rahman al-A'zami¹⁶ in his edition of al-Musannaf. The latter was the Shaykh of both Abdal Fattah Abu Ghudda and Muhammad Awwama.

Indian subcontinent Hanafi's like Khalil Ahmed al-Sahrani in his *Badhlul Majhud* (Sharh on Sunan Abu Dawud), Muhammad Zakariyya al-Kandhalawi in his

¹⁵ This Sharh was printed in Khanpur, India in 1299 AH. Shaykh Zafar Ahmed mentioned in his *I'lal-Sunan* (2/197) that Shaykh Abul Tayyib had declared not only the sanad to Wa'il's narration to be Sahih but also the text with the ziyada "under the navel."

¹⁶ This being an error due to being mislead by the late Bakr Abu Zayd of Saudi Arabia. Please see here for more clarification -

<https://archive.org/details/THOSEWHOTRULYPLIEDAGAINSTSHAYKHALAZAMI>

Awjaz al-Masalik (Sharh on Muwatta Malik), Muhammad Yusuf al-Binuri in his Ma'arif al-Sunan (Sharh on Jami al-Tirmidhi), Shabbir Ahmed Uthmani in his Fath al-Mulhim (Sharh on Sahih Muslim), Anwar Shah al-Kashmiri in his Sharh on Sahih al-Bukhari known as Fayd al-Bari, Zafar Ahmed al-Uthmani in his I'lā al-Sunan and Taqi Uthmani in his Dars-e-Tirmidhi all knew of the controversy surrounding the ziyada to Wa'il's narration. As for their affirmation or rejection of the ziyada, then that is another matter. Most of these authors did not appear to have known of the existence of the 8th century nuskha of the Musannaf or the later one in Muhammad Abid al-Sindi's time in Madina.

As for the point made by the Riyadh edition editors of al-Musannaf:

and the copyist's gaze probably jumped to the next athar [which has those very words], so he copied from it the words 'tahta al-surra.'"

The above argument is not a novel one but a repetition of what Hayat al-Sindi claimed. If this thesis was solid then how can one answer the point that the 8th century nuskha by the Hanbali scribe has the narration of Wa'il with the ziyada but the athar after it from al-Nakha'i is non-existent with in it?! Hence, one can not merely surmise that a scribe may have added the ziyada by accident from the Athar to the end of the narration from Wa'il (ra) without concrete proof. One could even build a case that may be a scribe missed the ziyada to Wa'il's narration while transcribing the words from another manuscript, or utilised a manuscript that may have scribal errors with in it from an earlier time.

Let us show what Shaykh Muhammad Hashim al-Sindi (d. 1174 AH) mentioned in his radd to Shaykh Hayat al-Sindi in his follow up rebuttals appended to the printed edition of Dirham al-Surra. Scans:

House of Verification

ترسيخ المدرسة

على

دراهم المدرسة

تأليف

العلامة المحدث الفقيه الشيخ محمد هاشم السندي التتوى
المتوفى سنة ١١٧٤ هـ

House of Verification

فيها لفظة «على الصدر»، خاتمة الأمر أنه سقط منها لفظة تحت السرة، وقد وجدت هي في ثلاثة نسخ من مصنف أبي بكر بن أبي شيبة:

منها النسخة التي نقلها عنها الشيخ قاسم محدث الديار المصرية رحمه الله تعالى وفيه غنى من الكل.

ومنها نسخة الشيخ محمد أكرم التصر بورى، رأيناها في بلاد السندي.

ومنها نسخة الشيخ عبد القادر مفتى مكة المعظمة، رأيناها في مكة، فمن أين هذا التعصب عن أمثالكم حيث حكمتم على النسخ الثلاث بسوء الكاتب، وعلى النسخة الواحدة الساقط عنها اللفظ بوجود لفظ «على الصدر» فيها، مع عدم وجودان لفظ على الصدر فيها، ولمَ لم تحكموا بالعكس^(١)، يا أخانا سلمكم الله تعالى على أنه لو فرض سقوط لفظة «تحت السرة» في نسخ متعددة للمصنف فلا يضرنا ذلك؛ لجواز نسبة ما في بعض نسخ الكتاب إلى مؤلفه، كما أنَّ حديث على وأبي هريرة رضي الله تعالى عنهما ينسبان إلى سُنْنَةِ أَبِي دَاوُدَ مَعَ وَجْدَانِهِمَا فِي بَعْضِ نَسْخَهَا.

والظن بأن نسخة الشيخ عبد الله بن سالم مصححة مخالف للعيان، فقد رأيناها ب تمام مجلداتها الأربع ما غيرَ فيها حرف بحرف، وما كُتبَ على هامشها لفظة، والظاهر أنه ما قرأ عليها أحدٌ وإنما لكتب عليه لفظاً في هامشه أو غيرَ حرقاً بغيره.

والذى ذكرتم بعد مراجعة شيخكم سُلَيْمَانُ اللهُ أَبْنَا بَكْرَ بْنَ أَبِي شَيْبَةَ قد ذكر بعد حديث وائل متصلًا أثر النخعى الذى فيه لفظة: «تحت السرة» يستند آخر، وأن نسخة الشيخ محمد أكرم سقط عنها أثر النخعى إلا لفظة «تحت السرة» فدل أن بعض الناسخين لما نسخ حديث وائل وقع نظره على لفظة «تحت السرة» من ذلك الأثر فألحقها بالحديث، وأسقط الأثر ما سوى تلك اللفظة، فكُتبت منها نسخ متعددة

(١) أى يكون تلك النسخة الواحدة موقع سوء الكاتب. (من المؤلف)

واشتهرت في البلاد، فوصلت واحدة منها إلى الشيخ قاسم رحمة الله تعالى إلى آخر ما ذكرت.

فالجواب عنه أنه قد ثبت وجود لفظة «تحت السرة» ملحقة بحديث وائل في النسخ الثلاث المتقدم ذكرها، أما في نسخة الشيخ قاسم رحمة الله تعالى في إخباره، وهو عدل. وأما في النسختين الآخرين فبالمشاهدة، فجريان مثل هذا الاحتمال المض لا يضره شيئاً، إذ الظاهر في نسخة الشيخ محمد أكرم أن لفظة «تحت السرة» من تمة الحديث كما هو الموجود الآن فيها، وأن أثر التخيّي ساقط منه بتمامه مع لفظة «تحت السرة». ومن الدليل عليه أن نسخة الشيخ عبد القادر مفتى مكة قد رأينا فيها لفظة «تحت السرة» في كل من الحديث والأثر المذكورين على حدة، فضعف ذلك الاحتمال، وظهر أن قولكم: فكتبت منها نسخ متعددة إلخ بناءً على هذا الاحتمال باطل. والقول بتباعد الروايتين المختلفتين مع اتحاد التابع والصحابي بعيد كما تقدم. وأما قولكم: فإذا عرفت أن كلاً من حديث وائل وآنس ضعيف معارض في نفسه، وحديث أبي هريرة ضعيف، وأن الراجح في حديث وائل «على صدره»، وإن سلمنا فمعارض في نفسه، وأن أثر ابن عباس خالي عن المعارضة، وكذا حديث هلب وطاؤس - عرفت أن ما ذكره صاحب الرسالة لعلمائنا الحنفية ليس فيه دليل قوى يقاوم ما ذكره من طرف الشافعية، بل كلها إما ضعاف معارض أو معارضة مرجوحة - فغلط من وجوه:

أما أولاً: فلأن التعارض عند أهل الأصول انتفاء كل من الدليلين عدم مقتضى الآخر، وليس من شرط تحققه ورود طرفيه عن صحابي واحد، فنقول: إن جميع الأحاديث المروية في الوضع على الصدر معارضه بأحاديث الوضع تحت السرة، فلا يكون أثر ابن عباس رضي الله عنهما ولا غيره حالياً عن المعارضة، وهل هذا إلا

محیار النقاد فی تمیز المخشوش عن الجیاد

تألیف

العلامة الحدث الفقيه الشيخ محمد هاشم السندي التسوی
المتوفى سنة ١١٧٤ هـ

من منشورات
إدارة القرآن والعلوم الإسلامية
کراتشی - باکستان

House of Verification

قلت: معلوم لديكم أن صاحب البحر وشارح المنية ليسا بمحاذين كثريين في علم الحديث حتى يكون قولهما يعبراً به في هذا الفن، والظاهر أنهما لم يطلعا على نسخة من صحيح ابن خزيمة؛ لأنَّه مفقود من المحرمين الشريفين زادهما الله شرفاً وتعظيمًا وكذلك مفقود من بعض نواحي مصر بكله أو بغالبه، بدليل قول العلامة ابن حجر الهيثمي المصري الأصل ثم المكي في شرحه على المشكاة: إن صحيح ابن خزيمة غالبه مفقود اليوم. انتهى، فكيف أطلع عليه صاحب البحر وشارح المنية؟ وإنما هما اعتمدَا على استدلال النبوى وأتباعِيهِ، وهم لم يصرحوا بتصحيح سنته غير الاستدلال المذكور، وقد قدمنا عن النبوى بنفسه في تقريره، وعن السيوطى في شرح التقرير أن الاستدلال لا يدل على الصحة، مع أن صاحب البحر وشارح المنية لم يصرحا في ذلك الحديث بالصحة، بل بالثبوت، والثابت مثل الصالح في كونه أعم من الصحيح حتى يشمل الحسن لذاته ولغيره، فيجوز على عباراتهما أن يكون حديث ابن خزيمة ضعيفاً في نفسه حسناً لغيره، فلا يزيد على الأحاديث الضعاف التي معناها ما لم يعلم صحة سنته بوجه آخر.

إن قيل: كيف يجوز أن يكون الثابت في كلامهما بهذا المعنى الأعم الشامل للحسن لغيره؛ لأنَّه يستلزم نفي أن يكون حديث عبد الرحمن بن إسحاق حسناً لغيره، وأنتم قائلون به.

قلنا: ليس اعتقادهما في حديث عبد الرحمن بالحسن لغيره؛ لعدم اطلاعهما على ذلك بسبب عدم خوضهما ونظرهما إلى ما ذكره المتقدمون في حق عبد الرحمن، فصح نفيهما باعتبار علمهما واطلاعهما.

وأما ما ذكرتم في حديث وائل بن حجر رضى الله عنه المذكور في مصنف أبي بكر بن أبي شيبة في وضع اليدين تحت السرة من احتمال إلحاق لفظ «تحت السرة»

- من الأثر الذي بعده معتمداً على نسخة الشيخ عبد الله بن سالم -فباطل؛ لأن النسخة غير المقابلة لا يجوز العمل عليها، ولا الرواية عنها إلا مقوومنا بالبيان عند البعض، ولا يجوز الاحتجاج بثبوت لفظ فيما فضلاً عن سقوطه عنها، ولهذا قال النووي في التقريب والسيوطى في شرحه: من أراد العمل أو الاحتجاج بحديث من كتاب فطريقه أن يأخذه من نسخة معتمدة قابليها هو أو ثقة بأصول صحيحة، وإن لم تقابل أصلاً فقد أجاز الرواية منه الأستاذ أبو إسحاق الإسفراينى والإسماعيلى بشروط ثلاثة: أن يكون الناقل للنسخة صحيح النقل قليل السقط، وأن يكون نقله من الأصل الصحيح، وأن بين حال الرواية أنه لم يقابل. وأما القاضى عياض، فجزم بمنع الرواية عند عدم المقابلة وإن اجتمعت الشروط، انتهى.

ولا شك أن نسخة الشيخ عبد الله بن سالم من مصنف أبي بكر بن أبي شيبة قد رأيتها بمجلداته الأربع، ما قبل منها ورقة ولا صفحة بل ولا شيء، فلا يجوز الاعتماد عليها على قول عياض أصلاً، ولا على قول غيره إلا عند اجتماع الشروط، ولم يُعلم اجتماعها ههنا، بل وجد لها نسختان معارضتان لها، فلا ينبغي الاعتماد عليها أصلاً، ونحن لم نحتاج بأمثال هذه النسخ غير المقابلة بل بنسخ تحرير الشيخ قاسم المقابلة المصححة المتعددة المتوافقة التي اتصل بنا سندها، فيكون الأخذ عنها كإخبار الشيخ قاسم إيانا، وخبر العدل الواحد مقبول في الديانات بالإجماع، وتكون النسختان المذكورتان مؤيدتين لخبره لامتحجا بهما، فانفرد نسخة واحدة غير مقابلة بسقوط لفظ لا يعارض خبر الواحد المؤيد بمثل تلك النسخة.

ولئن سلمنا التعارض فالقول لثبت الزيادة، ولا شك أن الشيخ قاسم رحمه الله من أكابر العلماء وأفضل المحدثين، وهو المعروف بابن الهمام الثاني، وهو شيخ الجلال السيوطى، والقططانى، والرملى الكبير وغيرهم من المحدثين، فاحتاجه من نسخة

عنه لأبي بكر بن أبي شيبة من غير بيان أنه غير مقابل دليل على أنه رحمه الله تعالى إنما نقل من نسخة مقابلة مصححة قابلة للاحتجاج؛ لأنَّه أعلم منا بشروط التحديد والرواية، فسقط ما ذكرتم من الاعتراضات من أصلها يأسراً لها، ولكن طالبتمنا بيان أن نسخة ابن أبي شيبة التي نقل عنها الشيخ قاسم لا يعلم صحتها ومقابلتها فلا يضرنا ذلك؛ لأنَّ نسخة تخرير الشيخ قاسم مصححة مقابلة، فيكونها الاعتماد عليها، ولا تصح تلك المطالبة، ولو صحت لطالبناكم بيان أن نسخة ابن خزيمة التي نقل عنها التوسي هل هي مصححة ومقابلة أم لا؟ فتأمل إن كنت من أهل التأمل.

قولكم: إن زيادة الثقة وإن كانت مقبولة، لكن لما رواه أحمد في مستذه والبيهقي في سنته بدون هذه الزيادة علم أن في تلك الزيادة خللا.

قلت: **هذا غير صحيح؛ لأنَّ الجمُور على أنَّ زيادة الثقة مقبولة مطلقاً، سواء وقعت عن رواه أو لا ناقصاً أم من غيره،** صرَّح به السيوطي في شرح التقرير، وأiben أمير الحاج في التقرير شرح التحرير. قال السيوطي: وادعى ابن طاهر عليه الإجماع، انتهى. مع أن ذلك لو كان موجباً للخلل لا يختل دليلكم بحديث مسند أحمد أصلاً؛ لأنَّه رواه أحمد بأسانيد زائدة على العشرة، والترمذى وأبن ماجة والدارقطنى وغيرهم عن قبيصة بن هلب عن أبيه مطلقاً من غير ذكر محل الوضع، وإنما وقع ذكر الخل في رواية واحدة لأحمد عن قبيصة بن هلب عن أبيه، فلو كان مثل ذلك يوجب الخلل لوجب الخلل عليكم قطعاً.

قولكم: ثم القاسم هل روى مصنف ابن أبي شيبة بسند صحيح متصل إلى المصنف أو لا؟ فإن كان الثاني فلا عبرة به إلى آخر ما ذكرتم من استقلال النسخ في كل جانب - فغير صحيح. أما المطالبة باتصال السند إلى المصنف فلأنَّه ذكر السيوطي في شرح التقرير عن الأستاذ أبي إسحاق الإسفرايني أنه قال: وقع

The following scan is from *Diyaur Rahman al-A'zami's notes to Fath al-Ghafur of Hayat al-Sindi* where he quoted what Shaykh Muhammad Qa'im al-Sindi had to say in his *Fawz al-Kiram* about the narration with the Ziyada, with the claim that the ziyada is found in most authentic manuscripts of the *Musannaf*:

وعلق عليه الشيخ أبو الحسن محمد قائم السندي في رسالته (فوز الكرام بما ثبت في وضع اليدين تحت السرة أو فوقها تحت الصدر عن الشفيع المظلل بالغمam) (٢٧/ب) بعد أن ذكر محسن ابن قطلوبيغا، (فمن الحال أن يعزرو إلى مصنف ابن أبي شيبة بما لا يكون صحيحاً، ورأيت يعني هذا الحديث المنيف في المصنف بهذه الزيادة التي نقلها الشيخ قاسم، ونقلُ الشيخ قاسم بعضُه عليه بالواحد، ولا يضر افراده كما لا يضر افراد الحافظ في نقله من الكتب المتداولة، وعدم وجودها في بعض النسخ لا يدل على نفي صحة هذه الزيادة، والزيادات في النسخ مقبولة كما أن صحيح البخاري المروي بروايات متعددة أطبق الشرح على الاحتجاج بجميع رواياته. فالقول بكون هذه الزيادة غلطًا مع حزم الشيخ قاسم بعزوها إلى المصنف، ومشاهدي إياها في نسخة وجودها في خزانة الشيخ عبد القادر المفي في الحديث والأثر لا يليق بالاتصاف إلى أن قال: وهذه الزيادة المروجدة في أكثر النسخ صحيحة) انتهى.

Shaykh Haddad said:

Mubarakpuri in Tuhtfat al-Ahwazi and Azim Abadi in `Awn al-Ma`bud provide decisive arguments in support of the position also held by al-Nimawi and Hayat al-Sindi.

These arguments mentioned by the two Salafist writers of India, al-Azimabadi and al-Mubarakpuri are hardly different from the line of disputation propounded by Shaykh Hayat al-Sindi before them. It is a fact that what Ibn Qutlubugha quoted from his nuskha of the Musannaf with the ziyada was never challenged by any Muhaddith in his time or after him until more than 2 centuries later by Hayat al-Sindi.

Shaykh Haddad claimed that Shaykh Muhammad ibn Ali al-Nimawi (d. 1322 AH) was also in line with Shaykh Hayat al-Sindi, but the final stance of al-Nimawi (from his notes upon his notes to his Athar al-Sunan) was also mentioned by Shaykh Haddad as follows:

"His words: 'however, it is weak from the aspect of text': I say: This is according to what we have ascertained just now. However, according to the position of hafiz Ibn Hajar in Sharh al-Nukhba, this addition is accepted [as textually authentic], and preponderance needs to be established between itself and whatever contradicts it; because this narration has a shorter chain than the narration 'on his chest' and the like, narrated by Ibn Khuzayma and al-Bazzar."

This is a parting shot to the effect that it would be more correct for the Hanafis to accept the ziyada "under the navel" than for the Shafi`is to accept the ziyada "on his chest", and he very laconically invokes Ibn Hajar's Sharh al-Nukhba concerning the "ziyada fil-matn", and Allah knows best.

In a later post, Shaykh Haddad mentioned the following from Ibn Hajar's Sharh on Nukhbatul Fikr on the Ziyada to texts:

"The addition of narrator of the sahih or hasan hadith is accepted as long as it does not negate the narration of someone more trustworthy who did not mention such an addition. Because an addition will either: (a) not contradict another narration which does not carry it, and such is accepted unconditionally, because it has the status of an independent hadith which a single trustworthy narrator related from his shaykh exclusively of anyone else relating the same, or (b) contradict another narration, in which case accepting it necessitates the exclusion of the other narration. The latter case is the one in which preponderance(tarjih) must be established between it and the one that contradicts it, whereby the preponderant one is accepted and the outweighed one is rejected."

Indeed, Shaykh al-Nimawi has also left an unpublished treatise on where the hands should be placed called Durratul Ghurra, and within it he may have left his final stance on this ziyada in the Musannaf. Wallahu a'lam.

As for Shaykh Haddad's point:

As for Shaykh Zafar al-Tahanawi's objection to al-Nimawi that "If that addition were found in only one copy, we would agree to his point; however, when it is found in many, then the probability that all the copyist's gazes went astray is not granted" (I`la' al-Sunan 2:199): this argument does not properly address the stemma. First, the same can be said of the manuscripts of Ibn Abi Shayba which do NOT have the ziyada: it is improbable the copyists all missed it. Second, it is quite possible that the ziyada copies all go back to a single faulty manuscript lesson.

Looking at I`la al-Sunan (2/197-199 of the Pakistani edition) of Shaykh Zafar Ahmed al-Uthmani al-Tahanawi (d. 1394 AH), one may note that he did not mention what al-Nimawi mentioned in his final footnote and this may be due to not having access to al-Nimawi's Ta'liq al-Ta'liq which consists of brief notes upon Ta'liq al-Hasan (by the same al-Nimawi). The edition by Shaykh Fayd Ahmed and printed by Maktaba Imdadiyya in Multan has all three works by al-Nimawi in a one volume edition.

As for the point: it is quite possible that the ziyada copies all go back to a single faulty manuscript lesson.

If that was a possibility then how does one explain the fact that we have to concede that there are three sets of manuscripts regarding the existence and non-existence of the ziyada:

- i) The manuscript(s) which have the narration from Wa'il without the Ziyada but have the athar of al-Nakha'i for placing beneath the navel. This may have been the edition available to all those who never knew of the ziyada to Wa'il's narration and hence never came across the other two editions mentioned below to reproduce in the books of fiqh or hadith commentary.
- ii) The manuscript(s) which have just the narration of Wa'il with the ziyada but missing the athar from al-Nakha'i. This being the 8th century nuskha by a Hanbali scribe, seen most probably by the Hanafi Ulama like: al-Ayni, Ibn Qutlubugha and later by Murtada al-Zabidi and some of our contemporaries.
- iii) The manuscript(s) with the ziyada to Wa'il's narration with the presence of the athar from al-Nakha'i - like that in the possession of Muhammad Abid al-Sindi and the Hanafi Mufti of Makka before his time, Shaykh Abdal Qadir al-Siddiqi

To conclude:

The ziyada has been a source of ikhtilaf for more than two and a half centuries to the extent that there is no absolute agreement on which nuskha is the most accurate when it comes to affirming the existence or denial of the ziyada. There are arguments for both sides and there seems to be a sizeable number of Hanafi Ulama who accepted the ziyada rather than rejected it outright. Those who prefer to reject the ziyada may have parallel arguments put against them by suggesting that may be a scribe missed out the ziyada unintentionally while transcribing from another manuscript. May be the batn narration from Wa'il ibn Hujr (ra) as in al-Tabarani's Mu'jam al-Kabir and Abu Nu'aym's Ma'rifatus Sahaba, though appearing weak in sanad was probably Salih to Abu Ahmed ibn Adi (in his al-Kamil) to the extent that it may strengthen the case that the ziyada in the Musannaf is acceptable overall. Wallahu a'lam

Abul Hasan
London
1st of Ramadan 1428 AH/September 13th 2007
(Updated in March 2013 for darultahqiq.com)